UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,064	01/04/2002	Joe Gaidjiergis	319578007US1	3578

27076 7590 11/16/2006

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
SUITE 3400
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98101

EXAMINER	
BUTLER, PATRICK	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1732	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/039,064	GAIDJIERGIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Patrick Butler	1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *17-81* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *17-81* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Applicant's Amendments and Accompanying Remarks, filed 29 August 2006, have been entered and have been carefully considered. Claims 62-81 are new, Claim 25 is amended, no Claims are canceled, and Claims 17-81 are pending.

In view of Applicant's amendment of claim 25, the Examiner withdraws the previously set forth 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection, as detailed in the Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112 section of the Office Action dated 27 February 2006.

Despite these advances, the invention as currently claimed is not found to be patentable for reasons herein below.

Claim Objections

Claims 52 and 67 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- In line 5 of Claim 52, the claim recites "0.040.07," which appears to be a typographical error of "0.04-0.07."
- In line 2 of Claim 67, the claim recites "element," which appears to be a typographical error of "elements."

Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claims 19 and 58 recite that the penetrating punches go "0.0625-0.**0**1875" inches. However, this range as recited by the specification is listed as

"0.0625-0.1875" inches. As such, the specification does not provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed punch penetration depth in claims 19 and 58.

The examiner believes that the recited claimed punch penetration depth in claims 19 and 58 is a typographical error and was intended to be "0.0625-0.1875" inches as provided in the applicant's original disclosure. As such, for the purpose of this Office action, the examiner has interpreted claims 19 and 58 as reciting a punch penetration depth of "0.0625-0.1875" inches.

An additional correction of the following is required: Claim 25 recites that the penetrating punches go "0.25-0.31625" inches; however, this recited range for the penetrating punches (e.g., "0.25-0.31625" inches) is only disclosed in the specification with reference to the thickness of the panel within the context of incomplete panel punching. As such, the specification does not provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed punch penetration depth in claims 25.

The examiner believes that the recited claimed punch penetration depth in claim 25 is a typographical error and was intended to be "0.0625-0.1875" inches as provided in the applicant's original disclosure. As such, for the purpose of this Office action, the examiner has interpreted claim 25 as reciting a punch penetration depth of "0.0625-0.1875" inches.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 19, 58, 62-70, 72, and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 19 and 58 recite that the penetrating punches go "0.0625-0.**0**1875" inches. However, this range as recited by the specification is listed as "0.0625-0.1875" inches. For the purpose of this Office action, the examiner has interpreted claim 25 as reciting a punch penetration depth of "0.0625-0.1875" inches.

In line 11 of Claim 62, the Claim recites "unconstrained to allow for outward lateral displacement thereof when the end is pressed against the first side." This recitation appears to be a negative limitation this is not supported by the specification. In line 2 of Claim 64, the Claim recites "at least coextensive." However, support is not found for all instances of biasing element length greater than the punch length. Claims 63-70 are rejected via their dependency.

In lines 5-6 of Claim 72, the Claim recites "allowing the at least one lateral peripheral surface to be outwardly laterally displaced." This recitation appears to be a negative limitation this is not supported by the specification. In line 2 of Claim 75, the Claim recites "at least coextensive." However, support is not found for all instances of biasing element length greater than the punch length.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 17-19, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,962,941 (Kober) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,580,374 (Quinnell).

Claims 17 and 18

Kober teaches a method for perforating and trimming boards of filamentary material (a method of fabricating) including providing a fiber plate 3 made using asbestos fibers held together by a hydraulic binder such as cement (providing a fiber-cement panel having a length, a width and a thickness); depositing the fiber plate 3 on one of a series of trays 7 linked together into an endless chain passing about terminal rollers; passing each of the trays 7 into a press 1 (placing the fiber-cement panel between) comprising an upper platen 9 having a plurality of punch means 8 for punching an array of holes in the fiber plate 3 (a punch assembly; the punch assembly having a punch plate and a plurality of punches coupled to the punch plate) and a lower platen 5 for supporting the fiber plate 3 during perforating and trimming (a support assembly); and lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (the support assembly having a support plate with a plurality of holes; driving the punches at least substantially simultaneously into and through at least a portion of the thickness of the fiber-cement panel to form a plurality of apertures in the fiber-cement panel by ejecting plugs from the fiber-cement panel through the holes in the support plate) (column 1, lines 13-17; column 3, lines 12-27; column 4, lines 19-39). As illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, Kober further teaches lowering all of the punch means 8

into fiber plate 3 at substantially the same time (driving the punches comprises penetrating the punches into the fiber-cement panel along the full length of the fiber-cement panel in one stroke of the punches).

Kober does not specifically teach that the boards are capable of being used as soffit boards. However, Quinnell teaches a soffit and fascia system comprising cement-based asbestos boards for use as the soffit boards including a plurality of ventilation slots that are formed in each soffit board (column 1, lines 15-28; column 2, lines 25-38). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punching process of Kober to form the soffit boards taught by Quinnell to provide a rapid and economical method for producing a low cost soffit and fascia system.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the thickness of the soffit boards is approximately 0.25 - 0.625 inches. However, the examiner takes Official notice that it was generally well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to produce cement-fiber soffit boards having thicknesses of about ¼" to ½" (i.e., 0.25 to 0.50 inches) as claimed. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to produce a cement-fiber soffit board having a thickness in the claimed range according the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as was well known in the art to provide a cement-fiber soffit board with good durability and sufficient strength to allow punching of the ventilation slots.

Claim 19

The discussion of Kober and Quinnell as applied to claim 17 above applies herein.

Kober and Quinnell do not appear to explicitly teach that the penetration depth is within the claimed range (e.g., 0.0625-0.1875 inches (without passing completely through)). However, in this regard, Kober further teaches that the platen 9 descends so that the pins punch perforations in the mat and drive the plugs out of the bore 11 (see col. 4, lines 24-35). As such, Kober obvious recognizes that penetration depth is a result-effective variable. Since penetration depth would be a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum penetration depth applied in the process of Kober and Quinnell through routine experimentation based upon driving out the plugs.

Claim 31

Kober teaches a method for perforating and trimming boards of filamentary material (a method of fabricating) including providing a fiber plate 3 made using asbestos fibers held together by a hydraulic binder such as cement; depositing the fiber plate 3 on one of a series of trays 7 linked together into an endless chain passing about terminal rollers; passing each of the trays 7 into a press 1 (placing the fiber-cement panel between) comprising an upper platen 9 having a plurality of punch means 8 for punching an array of holes in the fiber plate 3 (a punch assembly; the punch assembly having a punch plate and a plurality of punches coupled to the punch plate and a plurality of punches projecting from the punch plate) and a lower platen 5 for supporting

the fiber plate 3 during perforating and trimming (a support assembly); and lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (the support assembly having a support plate with a plurality of holes) (column 1, lines 13-17; column 3, lines 12-27; column 4, lines 19-39). As illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, Kober further teaches lowering all of the punch means 8 into fiber plate 3 at substantially the same time (forming a plurality of apertures in the fiber-cement panel at least substantially simultaneously by driving the punches at least substantially simultaneously through the fiber-cement panel).

With regard to the concept of driving the punches through only a portion of the fiber-cement panel without passing the punches completely through the panel, the examiner stipulates that Kober indirectly teaches this concept as further discussed hereafter. Kober further teaches that the upper platen 9 is provided with trimming blades 25 whose cutting edges are engageable against lead anvil strips 26 inset in the trays 7 to trim the edges all around the fiber plate 3 as the array of holes are punched through the fiber plate 3 (column 3, line 65 - column 4, line 2). As illustrated in the Figures, Kober further teaches that the punch means 8 are slightly shorter, but definitely no longer, in length than the trimming blades 25. If the travel of the trimming blades 25 and the upper platen 9 stops when trimming blades 25 engage against lead anvil strips 26 as taught and the punch means 8 are slightly shorter in length than the trimming blades 25, the punch means 8 in the process of Kober would obviously only pass

through a portion of the fiber plate 3 and would obviously be prevented from passing completely through the fiber plate 3 as claimed.

Kober does not specifically teach that the boards are capable of being used as soffit boards. However, Quinnell teaches a soffit and fascia system comprising cement-based asbestos boards for use as the soffit boards including a plurality of ventilation slots that are formed in each soffit board (column 1, lines 15-28; column 2, lines 25-38). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punching process of Kober to form the soffit boards taught by Quinnell to provide a rapid and economical method for producing a low cost soffit and fascia system.

Claim 32

The discussion of Kober and Quinnell as applied to claim 31 above applies herein.

Kober and Quinnell do not appear to explicitly teach that the penetration depth is within the claimed range (e.g., 0.0625-0.1875 inches (without passing completely through)). However, in this regard, Kober further teaches that the platen 9 descends so that the pins punch perforations in the mat and drive the plugs out of the bore 11 (see col. 4, lines 24-35). As such, Kober obviously recognizes that penetration depth is a result-effective variable. Since penetration depth would be a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum penetration depth applied in the process of Kober and Quinnell through routine experimentation based upon driving out the plugs.

Claims 20-22 and 33-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,962,941 (Kober) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,580,374 (Quinnell) and U.S. Patent No. 4,246,815 (Hugo) when taken in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph #006 of the applicant's original disclosure.

Claims 20-22 and 33-35

The discussion of Kober and Quinnell as applied to claims 17 and 31 above applies herein.

Kober further teaches that each of the punch means 8 comprises a pin 10 (the plurality of punches) carried on a plate 9b removably secured to the upper portion 9a (a flat punch plate) of the upper platen 9 (the punch assembly) (the punch assembly includes a flat punch plate and the plurality of punches project from the punch plate, the punches being spaced apart from one another, and the punches having a first end attached to the punch plate, a second end opposite the first end with a concave contact face, and a first diameter) (column 3, lines 24-27; Figures). Kober further teaches that the lower platen 5 (the support assembly) includes a plate (a flat support plate) having attached thereto a plurality of short upstanding tubes 18 each having a downwardly flaring passage 19 that terminates at its upper end at a bore 11 (the plurality of holes), for receiving a punched plug, having an inner diameter substantially equal to the outer diameter of the pins 10 (punches) (the support assembly includes a flat support plate and the plurality of holes extend through the support plate, each hole being aligned with a corresponding punch projecting from the punch plate, and the holes having a second diameter to provide a radial punch/hole clearance between the punches and the holes)

(column 3, lines 28-59; Figures). As discussed above, Kober further teaches that lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (driving the punches comprises moving the punches toward the holes and into the fiber-cement panel until the punches eject the plugs from the panel).

Although Kober teaches the basic claimed punch assembly / support assembly arrangement, Kober does not specifically teach the claimed diameters of the punches and holes and the claimed spacing of the punches. However, in this regard, Kober does teach that the perforation diameter may be changed by replacing plate 9b with another plate having differently sized pins 10 and even differently set blades 25, by replacing the plate 28, or by replacing the tubes 18 (column 4, lines 11-16). As such, Kober obviously recognizes that the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable. Since the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 through routine experimentation based upon the desired amount of ventilation, the thickness and type of fiber plate, etc.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the radial punch/hole clearance between the punches and the holes is approximately 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches (i.e., about 10% to about 40% of the second diameter of the holes and about 16% to about 64% of the first diameter of the punches) or is approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the

panel as claimed. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 (a flat support plate) mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram 11 (a flat punch plate) coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; claims).

Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo do not appear to explicitly teach that the claimed absolute and relative clearance is within the claimed range (e.g., 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches, approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes, or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the panel). However, in this regard, Hugo further teaches having a larger die at the bottom to allowed conical plug ejection (see Fig. 3; col. 2, lines 46-50; and col. 3, lines 8-11). As such, Hugo obvious recognizes that absolute and relative clearance is a result-effective variable. Since absolute and relative clearance would be a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum absolute and relative clearance applied in the process of Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo through routine experimentation based upon optimum plug ejection.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use a punch assembly and a support assembly having the claimed punch/hole clearance in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as taught by Hugo to provide a punching apparatus with reduced punch wear and breakage as taught by Hugo. Note that,

although Hugo only teaches punching metal workpieces (see claims) and does not specifically teach punching fiber-cement sheets, Hugo must be considered analogous prior art when taken in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph #006. Specifically, paragraph #006 of the applicant's original disclosure admits that it is known in the art to use sheet metal punches to form holes in fiber-cement sheets, and therefore the examiner stipulates that sheet metal punches and processes would be at least relatively pertinent to the applicant's particular problem.

Claims 36 and 37

The discussion of Kober and Quinnell as applied to claim 31 above applies herein.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches providing a plurality of biasing elements coupled to the punch assembly wherein the biasing elements are compressible, resilient member projecting from the punch plate adjacent to the punches and withdrawing the punches from the fiber-cement panel comprises pressing resilient biasing members against the fiber-cement panel adjacent to at least a subset of the plurality of punches when the punches penetrate into the fiber-cement panel. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 (a flat support plate) mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram 11 (a flat punch plate) coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 wherein the punch 15 is surrounded by an elastomerically deformable, annular insert 50 having a striking surface 54 for engaging the upper

surface of the workpiece W during punching (providing a plurality of biasing elements coupled to the punch assembly, the biasing elements being compressible, resilient members projecting from the punch plate adjacent to a punch; and withdrawing the punches from the fiber-cement panel by pressing the biasing elements against the fiber-cement panel proximate to at least a subset of the punches as the punches penetrate the fiber-cement panel) (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; column 3, lines 33-54; claims). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to surround the pins with annular inserts in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as taught by Hugo to provide a punching arrangement having a substantially reduced breakage rate in the punching of workpieces (see specifically column 1, lines 27-33 of Hugo). Note that, although Hugo only teaches punching metal workpieces (see claims) and does not specifically teach punching fiber-cement sheets, Hugo must be considered analogous prior art when taken in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph #006. Specifically, paragraph #006 of the applicant's original disclosure admits that it is known in the art to use sheet metal punches to form holes in fiber-cement sheets, and therefore the examiner stipulates that sheet metal punches and processes would be at least relatively pertinent to the applicant's particular problem.

Claims 38 and 42

Kober teaches a method for perforating and trimming boards of filamentary material (a method of fabricating) including providing a fiber plate 3 made using asbestos fibers held together by a hydraulic binder such as cement (providing a fiber-

cement panel having a thickness); depositing the fiber plate 3 on one of a series of trays 7 linked together into an endless chain passing about terminal rollers; passing each of the trays 7 into a press 1 (placing the fiber-cement panel between) comprising an upper platen 9 having a plurality of punch means 8 for punching an array of holes in the fiber plate 3 (a punch assembly; the punch assembly having a punch plate and a plurality of punches having a first cross-sectional dimension coupled to the punch plate) and a lower platen 5 for supporting the fiber plate 3 during perforating and trimming (a support assembly so that a first side of the panel faces the punch assembly and a second side of the panel faces the support assembly); and lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (the support assembly having a support plate with a plurality of holes having a second cross-sectional dimension; driving the punches through at least a portion of the fiber-cement panel to form a plurality of openings in the fiber-cement panel) (column 1, lines 13-17; column 3, lines 12-27; column 4, lines 19-39). As illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, Kober further teaches lowering all of the punch means 8 into fiber plate 3 at substantially the same time (driving the punches at least substantially simultaneously).

Kober does not specifically teach that the boards are capable of being used as soffit boards. However, Quinnell teaches a soffit and fascia system comprising cement-based asbestos boards for use as the soffit boards including a plurality of ventilation slots that are formed in each soffit board (column 1, lines 15-28; column 2, lines 25-38). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punching process of Kober to form the soffit boards taught by Quinnell to provide a rapid and economical method for producing a low cost soffit and fascia system. Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the perforations are tapered (i.e., have the first dimension of the punches at the first side of the panel and the second dimension of the holes at the second side of the panel) and that the second cross-sectional dimension of the holes is larger than the first cross-sectional dimension of the punches. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 (a flat support plate) mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram 11 (a flat punch plate) coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; claims). As illustrated in the marked-up version of Figure 3 below, Hugo further teaches that the punch 15 is driven into the die cavity 21 to eject a frustoconical plug from the workpiece W (driving the punches through at least a portion of the thickness of the fiber-cement panel to form a plurality of tapered openings in the fiber-cement panel; driving the punches through at least a portion of the fiber-cement panel to form a plurality of openings in the fiber-cement panel that have the first dimension of the punches at the first side of the panel and the second dimension of the holes at the second side of the panel) and that the diameter of the die cavity 21 is larger than the diameter of the punch 15 (a plurality of holes having a second cross-sectional dimension larger than the first cross-sectional dimension of the punches). It would have

been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punch / support arrangement taught by Hugo in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell to provide a punching arrangement having a substantially reduced breakage rate in the punching of workpieces (see specifically column 1, lines 27-33 of Hugo). Note that, although Hugo only teaches punching metal workpieces (see claims) and does not specifically teach punching fiber-cement sheets, Hugo must be considered analogous prior art when taken in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph #006. Specifically, paragraph #006 of the applicant's original disclosure admits that it is known in the art to use sheet metal punches to form holes in fiber-cement sheets, and therefore the examiner stipulates that sheet metal punches and processes would be at least relatively pertinent to the applicant's particular problem.

Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo do not specifically teaches that the thickness of the soffit boards is approximately 0.25 - 0.625 inches. However, the examiner takes Official notice that it was generally well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to produce cement-fiber soffit boards having thicknesses of about ¼" to ½" (i.e., 0.25 to 0.50 inches) as claimed. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to produce a cement-fiber soffit board having a thickness in the claimed range according the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as was well known in the art to provide a cement-fiber soffit board with good durability and sufficient strength to allow punching of the ventilation slots.

Claims 39 and 43

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell, Hugo and the admitted prior art as applied to claims 38 and 42 above applies herein.

With regard to the concept of driving the punches through only a portion of the fiber-cement panel without passing the punches completely through the panel, the examiner stipulates that Kober indirectly teaches this concept as further discussed hereafter. Kober further teaches that the upper platen 9 is provided with trimming blades 25 whose cutting edges are engageable against lead anvil strips 26 inset in the trays 7 to trim the edges all around the fiber plate 3 as the array of holes are punched through the fiber plate 3 (column 3, line 65 - column 4, line 2). As illustrated in the Figures, Kober further teaches that the punch means 8 are slightly shorter, but definitely no longer, in length than the trimming blades 25. If the travel of the trimming blades 25 and the upper platen 9 stops when trimming blades 25 engage against lead anvil strips 26 as taught and the punch means 8 are slightly shorter in length than the trimming blades 25, the punch means 8 in the process of Kober would obviously only pass through a portion of the fiber plate 3 and would obviously be prevented from passing completely through the fiber plate 3 as claimed.

Claims 40 and 44

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell, Hugo and the admitted prior art as applied to claims 38 and 42 above applies herein.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches driving the punches completely through the fiber-cement panel to eject the plugs from the fiber-cement panel.

However, as illustrated in Figure 3, Hugo further teaches that the punch 15 is driven into the die cavity 21 to eject a frustoconical plug from the workpiece W (driving the punches comprises passing the punches along a stroke path completely through the fiber-cement panel and ejecting the plugs from the panel in the direction of the punch stroke). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to drive the punches completely through the fiber plate in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as taught by Hugo to assure that the plugs were completely ejected from the fiber plate.

Claims 41 and 45-48

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell, Hugo and the admitted prior art as applied to claims 38 and 42 above applies herein.

Kober further teaches that each of the punch means 8 comprises a pin 10 carried on a plate 9b removably secured to the upper portion 9a of the upper platen 9 (the punches are arranged in an array and have a diameter) (column 3, lines 24-27; Figures). Kober further teaches that the lower platen 5 includes a plate having attached thereto a plurality of short upstanding tubes 18 each having a downwardly flaring passage 19 that terminates at its upper end at a bore 11, for receiving a punched plug, having an inner diameter substantially equal to the outer diameter of the pins 10 (the holes are arranged in a corresponding array and have a diameter) (column 3, lines 28-59; Figures). As discussed above, Kober further teaches that lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (driving the punches comprises moving the

punches along a punch stroke into the fiber-cement panel until the punches eject plugs from the panel in the direction of the punch stroke).

Although Kober teaches the basic claimed punch assembly / support assembly arrangement, Kober does not specifically teach the claimed diameters of the punches and holes. However, in this regard, Kober does teach that the perforation diameter may be changed by replacing plate 9b with another plate having differently sized pins 10 and even differently set blades 25, by replacing the plate 28, or by replacing the tubes 18 (column 4, lines 11-16). As such, Kober obviously recognizes that the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable. Since the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell and Hugo, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 through routine experimentation based upon the desired amount of ventilation, the thickness and type of fiber plate, etc.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the radial punch/hole clearance between the punches and the holes is approximately 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches (i.e., about 10% to about 40% of the second diameter of the holes and about 16% to about 64% of the first diameter of the punches) or is approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the panel as claimed. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram

11 coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; claims).

Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo do not appear to explicitly teach that the claimed absolute and relative clearance is within the claimed range (e.g., 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches, approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes, or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the panel). However, in this regard, Hugo further teaches having a larger die at the bottom to allowed conical plug ejection (see Fig. 3; col. 2, lines 46-50; and col. 3, lines 8-11). As such, Hugo obvious recognizes that absolute and relative clearance is a result-effective variable. Since absolute and relative clearance would be a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum absolute and relative clearance applied in the process of Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo through routine experimentation based upon optimum plug ejection.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use a punch assembly and a support assembly having the claimed punch/hole clearance in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as taught by Hugo to provide a punching apparatus with reduced punch wear and breakage as taught by Hugo.

Claims 49 and 50

Kober teaches a method for perforating and trimming boards of filamentary material (a method of fabricating) including providing a fiber plate 3 made using asbestos fibers held together by a hydraulic binder such as cement (providing a fiber-

cement panel having a length, a width and a thickness); depositing the fiber plate 3 on one of a series of trays 7 linked together into an endless chain passing about terminal rollers; passing each of the trays 7 into a press 1 (placing the fiber-cement panel between) comprising an upper platen 9 having a plurality of punch means 8 for punching an array of holes in the fiber plate 3 (a punch assembly; the punch assembly having a punch plate and a plurality of punches having a first cross-sectional dimension coupled to the punch plate) and a lower platen 5 for supporting the fiber plate 3 during perforating and trimming (a support assembly so that a first side of the panel faces the punch assembly and a second side of the panel faces the support assembly); and lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (the support assembly having a support plate with a plurality of holes having a second cross-sectional dimension; driving the punches through at least a portion of the fiber-cement panel to form a plurality of openings in the fiber-cement panel) (column 1, lines 13-17; column 3, lines 12-27; column 4, lines 19-39). As illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, Kober further teaches lowering all of the punch means 8 into fiber plate 3 at substantially the same time (driving the punches at least substantially simultaneously; driving the punches comprises punching holes in the fiber-cement panel along a full length of the panel in one punch stroke).

Kober does not specifically teach that the boards are capable of being used as soffit boards. However, Quinnell teaches a soffit and fascia system comprising cement-based asbestos boards for use as the soffit boards including a plurality of ventilation

slots that are formed in each soffit board (column 1, lines 15-28; column 2, lines 25-38). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punching process of Kober to form the soffit boards taught by Quinnell to provide a rapid and economical method for producing a low cost soffit and fascia system. Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the second cross-sectional dimension of the holes is larger than the first cross-sectional dimension of the punches. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 (a flat support plate) mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram 11 (a flat punch plate) coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; claims). As illustrated in the marked-up version of Figure 3 below, Hugo further teaches that the punch 15 is driven into the die cavity 21 to eject a frustoconical plug from the workpiece W (driving the punches through at least a portion of the thickness of the fiber-cement panel to form a plurality of openings in the fiber-cement panel) and that the diameter of the die cavity 21 is larger than the diameter of the punch 15 (a plurality of holes having a second cross-sectional dimension larger than the first cross-sectional dimension of the punches). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punch / support arrangement taught by Hugo in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell to provide a punching arrangement having a substantially

reduced breakage rate in the punching of workpieces (see specifically column 1, lines 27-33 of Hugo). Note that, although Hugo only teaches punching metal workpieces (see claims) and does not specifically teach punching fiber-cement sheets, Hugo must be considered analogous prior art when taken in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph #006. Specifically, paragraph #006 of the applicant's original disclosure admits that it is known in the art to use sheet metal punches to form holes in fiber-cement sheets, and therefore the examiner stipulates that sheet metal punches and processes would be at least relatively pertinent to the applicant's particular problem.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches pressing a compressible biasing element against the first side of the fiber-cement panel as the punches move along the punch stroke. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram 11 coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 wherein the punch 15 is surrounded by an elastomerically deformable, annular insert 50 having a striking surface 54 for engaging the upper surface of the workpiece W during punching (pressing a compressible biasing element against the first side of the fiber-cement panel as the punches move along the punch stroke) (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; column 3, lines 33-54; claims). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to

surround the pins with annular inserts in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as taught by Hugo to provide a punching arrangement having a substantially reduced breakage rate in the punching of workpieces (see specifically column 1, lines 27-33 of Hugo).

Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo do not specifically teaches that the thickness of the soffit boards is approximately 0.25 - 0.625 inches. However, the examiner takes Official notice that it was generally well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to produce cement-fiber soffit boards having thicknesses of about ¼" to ½" (i.e., 0.25 to 0.50 inches) as claimed. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to produce a cement-fiber soffit board having a thickness in the claimed range according the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as was well known in the art to provide a cement-fiber soffit board with good durability and sufficient strength to allow punching of the ventilation slots.

Claim 51

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell, Hugo and the admitted prior art as applied to claim 49 above applies herein.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches driving the punches completely through the fiber-cement panel to eject the plugs from the fiber-cement panel. However, as illustrated in Figure 3, Hugo further teaches that the punch 15 is driven into the die cavity 21 to eject a frustoconical plug from the workpiece W (driving the punches comprises passing the punches along a stroke path completely through the fiber-

cement panel and ejecting the plugs from the panel in the direction of the punch stroke). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to drive the punches completely through the fiber plate in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as taught by Hugo to assure that the plugs were completely ejected from the fiber plate.

Claims 52-55

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell, Hugo and the admitted prior art as applied to claim 49 above applies herein.

Kober further teaches that each of the punch means 8 comprises a pin 10 carried on a plate 9b removably secured to the upper portion 9a of the upper platen 9 (the punches are arranged in an array and have a diameter) (column 3, lines 24-27; Figures). Kober further teaches that the lower platen 5 includes a plate having attached thereto a plurality of short upstanding tubes 18 each having a downwardly flaring passage 19 that terminates at its upper end at a bore 11, for receiving a punched plug, having an inner diameter substantially equal to the outer diameter of the pins 10 (the holes are arranged in a corresponding array and have a diameter) (column 3, lines 28-59; Figures). As discussed above, Kober further teaches that lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (driving the punches comprises moving the punches into the fiber-cement panel to form openings).

Although Kober teaches the basic claimed punch assembly / support assembly arrangement, Kober does not specifically teach the claimed diameters of the punches

and holes. However, in this regard, Kober does teach that the perforation diameter may be changed by replacing plate 9b with another plate having differently sized pins 10 and even differently set blades 25, by replacing the plate 28, or by replacing the tubes 18 (column 4, lines 11-16). As such, Kober obviously recognizes that the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable. Since the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell and Hugo, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 through routine experimentation based upon the desired amount of ventilation, the thickness and type of fiber plate, etc.

Note that, as discussed above with regard to claim 49, Hugo further teaches that the punch 15 is driven into the die cavity 21 to eject a frustoconical plug from the workpiece W (driving the punches comprises moving the punches into the fiber-cement panel to form openings having a first dimension at the first side of the panel and a second dimension larger than the first dimension at the second side of the panel).

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the radial punch/hole clearance between the punches and the holes is approximately 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches (i.e., about 10% to about 40% of the second diameter of the holes and about 16% to about 64% of the first diameter of the punches) or is approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the panel as claimed. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram

11 coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; claims).

Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo do not appear to explicitly teach that the claimed absolute and relative clearance is within the claimed range (e.g., 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches, approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes, or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the panel). However, in this regard, Hugo further teaches having a larger die at the bottom to allowed conical plug ejection (see Fig. 3; col. 2, lines 46-50; and col. 3, lines 8-11). As such, Hugo obvious recognizes that absolute and relative clearance is a result-effective variable. Since absolute and relative clearance would be a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum absolute and relative clearance applied in the process of Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo through routine experimentation based upon optimum plug ejection.

Claims 23-25 and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,962,941 (Kober) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,580,374 (Quinnell) and U.S. Patent No. 4,985,119 (Vinson et al.).

Claims 23 and 24

Kober teaches a method for perforating and trimming boards of filamentary material (a method of fabricating) including providing a fiber plate 3 made using asbestos fibers held together by a hydraulic binder such as cement (providing a fiber-cement panel having a thickness); depositing the fiber plate 3 on one of a series of trays 7 linked together into an endless chain passing about terminal rollers; passing each of

the trays 7 into a press 1 (placing the fiber-cement panel between) comprising an upper platen 9 having a plurality of punch means 8 for punching an array of holes in the fiber plate 3 (a punch assembly; the punch assembly having a punch plate and a plurality of punches coupled to the punch plate) and a lower platen 5 for supporting the fiber plate 3 during perforating and trimming (a support assembly); and lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (the support assembly having a support plate with a plurality of holes; driving the punches at least substantially simultaneously into and through at least a portion of the thickness of the fiber-cement panel to form a plurality of apertures in the fiber-cement panel by ejecting plugs from the fiber-cement panel through the holes in the support surface); and lifting the trays 7 off of the lower platen 5 to pull the board free at the region of the tray holes (withdrawing the punches from the fiber-cement panel without delaminating the fiber-cement panel at the apertures) (column 1, lines 13-17; column 2, lines 53-64; column 3, lines 12-27; column 4, lines 19-39). As illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, Kober further teaches lowering all of the punch means 8 into fiber plate 3 at substantially the same time (driving the punches comprises penetrating the punches into the fiber-cement panel along the full length of the fiber-cement panel in one stroke of the punches). Note that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized, when viewing the teachings of Kober as a whole, that the lifting off of the trays would have obviously been performed without any significant delaminating at the apertures.

Kober does not specifically teach that the boards are capable of being used as soffit boards. However, Quinnell teaches a soffit and fascia system comprising cement-based asbestos boards for use as the soffit boards including a plurality of ventilation slots that are formed in each soffit board (column 1, lines 15-28; column 2, lines 25-38). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punching process of Kober to form the soffit boards taught by Quinnell to provide a rapid and economical method for producing a low cost soffit and fascia system.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the thickness of the soffit boards is approximately 0.25 - 0.625 inches. However, the examiner takes Official notice that it was generally well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to produce cement-fiber soffit boards having thicknesses of about ¼" to ½" (i.e., 0.25 to 0.50 inches) as claimed. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to produce a cement-fiber soffit board having a thickness in the claimed range according the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as was well known in the art to provide a cement-fiber soffit board with good durability and sufficient strength to allow punching of the ventilation slots.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the fiber plate may comprise cellulosic material instead of asbestos. However, Vinson et al. teach a method for making fiber-reinforced structures and building materials from water-curable inorganic binders, such as cement and calcium silicate, and fibers wherein the traditional

asbestos fibers are replaced with natural cellulosic fibers such as softwood fibers, hardwood fibers and a variety of vegetable fibers (the fiber-cement panel comprising cement, cellulosic material, and a binder) (column 1, lines 11-29). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use cellulosic fibers as a replacement for the asbestos fibers in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as taught by Vinson et al. to provide a fiber reinforcement with fewer safety and health concerns as set forth in Vinson et al.

Claim 25

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell, and Vinson as applied to claim 23 above applies herein.

Kober, Quinnell, and Vinson do not appear to explicitly teach that the penetration depth is within the claimed range (e.g., 0.0625-0.1875 inches (without passing completely through)). However, in this regard, Kober further teaches that the platen 9 descends so that the pins punch perforations in the mat and drive the plugs out of the bore 11 (see col. 4, lines 24-35). As such, Kober obviously recognizes that penetration depth is a result-effective variable. Since penetration depth would be a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum penetration depth applied in the process of Kober, Quinnell, and Vinson through routine experimentation based upon driving out the plugs.

Claims 56 and 57

Kober teaches a method for perforating and trimming boards of filamentary material (a method of fabricating) including providing a fiber plate 3 made using asbestos fibers held together by a hydraulic binder such as cement (providing a fiber-cement panel comprising cement and having a length, a width and a thickness); depositing the fiber plate 3 on one of a series of trays 7 linked together into an endless chain passing about terminal rollers; passing each of the trays 7 into a press 1 (placing the fiber-cement panel between) comprising an upper platen 9 having a plurality of punch means 8 for punching an array of holes in the fiber plate 3 (a punch assembly; the punch assembly having a punch plate and a plurality of punches coupled to the punch plate) and a lower platen 5 for supporting the fiber plate 3 during perforating and trimming (a support assembly); and lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (the support assembly having a support plate with a plurality of holes; driving the punches at least substantially simultaneously into and through at least a portion of the thickness of the fiber-cement panel to form a plurality of apertures in the fiber-cement panel by ejecting plugs from the fiber-cement panel through the holes in the support plate) (column 1, lines 13-17; column 3, lines 12-27; column 4, lines 19-39). As illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, Kober further teaches lowering all of the punch means 8 into fiber plate 3 at substantially the same time (driving the punches comprises penetrating the punches into the fiber-cement panel along the full length of the fiber-cement panel in one stroke of the punches).

Kober does not specifically teach that the boards are capable of being used as soffit boards. However, Quinnell teaches a soffit and fascia system comprising cement-based asbestos boards for use as the soffit boards including a plurality of ventilation slots that are formed in each soffit board (column 1, lines 15-28; column 2, lines 25-38). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punching process of Kober to form the soffit boards taught by Quinnell to provide a rapid and economical method for producing a low cost soffit and fascia system.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the thickness of the soffit boards is approximately 0.25 - 0.625 inches. However, the examiner takes Official notice that it was generally well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to produce cement-fiber soffit boards having thicknesses of about ¼" to ½" (i.e., 0.25 to 0.50 inches) as claimed. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to produce a cement-fiber soffit board having a thickness in the claimed range according the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as was well known in the art to provide a cement-fiber soffit board with good durability and sufficient strength to allow punching of the ventilation slots.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the fiber plate may comprise cellulosic material instead of asbestos. However, Vinson et al. teach a method for making fiber-reinforced structures and building materials from water-curable inorganic binders, such as cement and calcium silicate, and fibers wherein the traditional

asbestos fibers are replaced with natural cellulosic fibers such as softwood fibers, hardwood fibers and a variety of vegetable fibers (the fiber-cement panel comprising cement, cellulosic material, and a binder) (column 1, lines 11-29). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use cellulosic fibers as a replacement for the asbestos fibers in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as taught by Vinson et al. to provide a fiber reinforcement with fewer safety and health concerns as set forth in Vinson et al.

Claim 58

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell, and Vinson as applied to claim 23 above applies herein.

Kober, Quinnell, and Vinson do not appear to explicitly teach that the penetration depth is within the claimed range (e.g., 0.0625-0.1875 inches (without passing completely through)). However, in this regard, Kober further teaches that the platen 9 descends so that the pins punch perforations in the mat and drive the plugs out of the bore 11 (see col. 4, lines 24-35). As such, Kober obviously recognizes that penetration depth is a result-effective variable. Since penetration depth would be a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum penetration depth applied in the process of Kober, Quinnell, and Vinson through routine experimentation based upon driving out the plugs.

Claims 26-30 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,962,941 (Kober) in view of U.S. Patent No.

4,580,374 (Quinnell), U.S. Patent No. 4,985,119 (Vinson et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 4,246,815 (Hugo) when taken in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph #006 of the applicant's original disclosure.

Claims 26-28

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell and Vinson et al. as applied to claim 23 above applies herein.

Kober further teaches that each of the punch means 8 comprises a pin 10 (the plurality of punches) carried on a plate 9b removably secured to the upper portion 9a (a flat punch plate) of the upper platen 9 (the punch assembly) (the punch assembly includes a flat punch plate and the plurality of punches project from the punch plate, the punches being spaced apart from one another, and the punches having a first end attached to the punch plate, a second end opposite the first end with a concave contact face, and a first diameter) (column 3, lines 24-27; Figures). Kober further teaches that the lower platen 5 (the support assembly) includes a plate (a flat support plate) having attached thereto a plurality of short upstanding tubes 18 each having a downwardly flaring passage 19 that terminates at its upper end at a bore 11 (the plurality of holes), for receiving a punched plug, having an inner diameter substantially equal to the outer diameter of the pins 10 (punches) (the support assembly includes a flat support plate and the plurality of holes extend through the support plate, each hole being aligned with a corresponding punch projecting from the punch plate, and the holes having a second diameter to provide a radial punch/hole clearance between the punches and the holes) (column 3, lines 28-59; Figures). As discussed above, Kober further teaches that

lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (driving the punches comprises moving the punches toward the holes and into the fiber-cement panel until the punches eject the plugs from the panel).

Although Kober teaches the basic claimed punch assembly / support assembly arrangement, Kober does not specifically teach the claimed diameters of the punches and holes and the claimed spacing of the punches. However, in this regard, Kober does teach that the perforation diameter may be changed by replacing plate 9b with another plate having differently sized pins 10 and even differently set blades 25, by replacing the plate 28, or by replacing the tubes 18 (column 4, lines 11-16). As such, Kober obviously recognizes that the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable. Since the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell and Vinson et al., one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 through routine experimentation based upon the desired amount of ventilation, the thickness and type of fiber plate, etc.

Neither Kober, Quinnell nor Vinson et al. specifically teaches that the radial punch/hole clearance between the punches and the holes is approximately 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches (i.e., about 10% to about 40% of the second diameter of the holes and about 16% to about 64% of the first diameter of the punches) or is approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the panel as claimed. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick

workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 (a flat support plate) mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram 11 (a flat punch plate) coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; claims).

Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo do not appear to explicitly teach that the claimed absolute and relative clearance is within the claimed range (e.g., 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches, approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes, or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the panel). However, in this regard, Hugo further teaches having a larger die at the bottom to allowed conical plug ejection (see Fig. 3; col. 2, lines 46-50; and col. 3, lines 8-11). As such, Hugo obvious recognizes that absolute and relative clearance is a result-effective variable. Since absolute and relative clearance would be a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum absolute and relative clearance applied in the process of Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo through routine experimentation based upon optimum plug ejection.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use a punch assembly and a support assembly having the claimed punch/hole clearance in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell and Vinson et al. as taught by Hugo to provide a punching apparatus with reduced punch wear and breakage as taught by Hugo. Note that, although Hugo only teaches punching metal workpieces (see claims) and does not

specifically teach punching fiber-cement sheets, Hugo must be considered analogous prior art when taken in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph #006. Specifically, paragraph #006 of the applicant's original disclosure admits that it is known in the art to use sheet metal punches to form holes in fiber-cement sheets, and therefore the examiner stipulates that sheet metal punches and processes would be at least relatively pertinent to the applicant's particular problem.

Claims 29 and 30

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell and Vinson et al. as applied to claim 23 above applies herein.

Neither Kober, Quinnell nor Vinson et al. specifically teaches providing a plurality of biasing elements coupled to the punch assembly wherein the biasing elements are compressible, resilient member projecting from the punch plate adjacent to the punches and withdrawing the punches from the fiber-cement panel comprises pressing resilient biasing members against the fiber-cement panel adjacent to at least a subset of the plurality of punches when the punches penetrate into the fiber-cement panel. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 (a flat support plate) mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram 11 (a flat punch plate) coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 wherein the punch 15 is surrounded by an elastomerically deformable, annular insert 50 having a striking surface 54 for engaging the upper surface of the workpiece W during punching (providing a plurality of biasing

elements coupled to the punch assembly, the biasing elements being compressible, resilient members projecting from the punch plate adjacent to a punch; and withdrawing the punches from the fiber-cement panel by pressing the biasing elements against the fiber-cement panel proximate to at least a subset of the punches as the punches penetrate the fiber-cement panel) (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; column 3, lines 33-54; claims). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to surround the pins with annular inserts in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell and Vinson et al. as taught by Hugo to provide a punching arrangement having a substantially reduced breakage rate in the punching of workpieces (see specifically column 1, lines 27-33 of Hugo). Note that, although Hugo only teaches punching metal workpieces (see claims) and does not specifically teach punching fiber-cement sheets, Hugo must be considered analogous prior art when taken in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph #006. Specifically, paragraph #006 of the applicant's original disclosure admits that it is known in the art to use sheet metal punches to form holes in fiber-cement sheets, and therefore the examiner stipulates that sheet metal punches and processes would be at least relatively pertinent to the applicant's particular problem.

Claims 59-61

The discussion of Kober, Quinnell, and Vinson as applied to claim 56 above applies herein.

Kober further teaches that each of the punch means 8 comprises a pin 10 (the plurality of punches) carried on a plate 9b removably secured to the upper portion 9a (a flat punch plate) of the upper platen 9 (the punch assembly) (the punch assembly includes a flat punch plate and the plurality of punches project from the punch plate, the punches being spaced apart from one another, and the punches having a first end attached to the punch plate, a second end opposite the first end with a concave contact face, and a first diameter) (column 3, lines 24-27; Figures). Kober further teaches that the lower platen 5 (the support assembly) includes a plate (a flat support plate) having attached thereto a plurality of short upstanding tubes 18 each having a downwardly flaring passage 19 that terminates at its upper end at a bore 11 (the plurality of holes), for receiving a punched plug, having an inner diameter substantially equal to the outer diameter of the pins 10 (punches) (the support assembly includes a flat support plate and the plurality of holes extend through the support plate, each hole being aligned with a corresponding punch projecting from the punch plate, and the holes having a second diameter to provide a radial punch/hole clearance between the punches and the holes) (column 3, lines 28-59; Figures). As discussed above, Kober further teaches that lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (driving the punches comprises moving the punches toward the holes and into the fiber-cement panel until the punches eject the plugs from the panel).

Although Kober teaches the basic claimed punch assembly / support assembly arrangement, Kober does not specifically teach the claimed diameters of the punches

and holes and the claimed spacing of the punches. However, in this regard, Kober does teach that the perforation diameter may be changed by replacing plate 9b with another plate having differently sized pins 10 and even differently set blades 25, by replacing the plate 28, or by replacing the tubes 18 (column 4, lines 11-16). As such, Kober obviously recognizes that the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable. Since the arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 is a result-effective variable in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum arrangement of the pins 10 and the tubes 18 through routine experimentation based upon the desired amount of ventilation, the thickness and type of fiber plate, etc.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell specifically teaches that the radial punch/hole clearance between the punches and the holes is approximately 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches (i.e., about 10% to about 40% of the second diameter of the holes and about 16% to about 64% of the first diameter of the punches) or is approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the panel as claimed. However, Hugo teaches a power press for punching thick workpieces of metal comprising a bed 10 having a die plate 20 (a flat support plate) mounted thereon with a punch receiving opening or die cavity 21 (holes) therein cooperating with a reciprocating ram 11 (a flat punch plate) coupled to a drive 12 having a punch 15 (punches) with a extended nib 16 of constant diameter and a tip 17 (column 1, lines 5-9; column 2, lines 38-52; claims).

Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo do not appear to explicitly teach that the claimed absolute and relative clearance is within the claimed range (e.g., 0.04 inches to 0.07 inches, approximately 4% to 30% of the second diameter of the holes, or approximately 4% to 40% of the thickness of the panel). However, in this regard, Hugo further teaches having a larger die at the bottom to allowed conical plug ejection (see Fig. 3; col. 2, lines 46-50; and col. 3, lines 8-11). As such, Hugo obvious recognizes that absolute and relative clearance is a result-effective variable. Since absolute and relative clearance would be a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously determined the optimum absolute and relative clearance applied in the process of Kober, Quinnell, and Hugo through routine experimentation based upon optimum plug ejection.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use a punch assembly and a support assembly having the claimed punch/hole clearance in the process of Kober in view of Quinnell as taught by Hugo to provide a punching apparatus with reduced punch wear and breakage as taught by Hugo. Note that, although Hugo only teaches punching metal workpieces (see claims) and does not specifically teach punching fiber-cement sheets, Hugo must be considered analogous prior art when taken in view of the applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph #006. Specifically, paragraph #006 of the applicant's original disclosure admits that it is known in the art to use sheet metal punches to form holes in fiber-cement sheets, and

therefore the examiner stipulates that sheet metal punches and processes would be at least relatively pertinent to the applicant's particular problem.

Claims 62-64, 66-75, and 77-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,230,043 (Moran) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,962,941 (Kober) and U.S. Patent No. 4,580,374 (Quinnell).

With respect to Claim 62, Moran teaches placing a sheet material (panel) between one or more punches 10 attached to a support 12 (punch assembly; punch plate; plurality of punches coupled to the punch plate) and a stationary support 15 with holes (support assembly; support plate with a plurality of holes therein corresponding to the arrangement of the punches) (see page 1 of text, left column, lines 1-29 and right column, lines 13-41; Fig. 1). As arranged, the sheet material has a first side facing the punch assembly and a second side facing the support assembly. Moran teaches driving the punches along a punch stroke through at least a portion of the sheet material to form a plurality of openings therein (see Fig. 2). Moran teaches pressing a plurality of rubber spools 20 (resilient biasing elements) against the first side of the sheet material as the punches move along the punch stroke, each of the rubber spools having an end and at least one lateral peripheral surface that is unconstrained to allow for outward lateral displacement thereof when the end is pressed against the first side (see page 1 of text, right column, lines 13-41; Fig. 2).

Moran teaches using a sheet material, but does not expressly teach that the material is a fiber-cement panel.

Kober teaches a method for perforating boards of filamentary material made using asbestos fibers held together by a hydraulic binder such as cement (a fiber-cement panel) (column 1, lines 13-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kober's punching of fiber-cement panels with Moran's invention is for punching sheet material (see Moran, page 1 of text, left column, lines 1-5) and Kober provides a sheet material that is to be punched (see Kober, column 1, lines 13-17).

Moran does not specifically teach that the boards are capable of being used as soffit boards. However, Quinnell teaches a soffit and fascia system comprising cement-based asbestos boards for use as the soffit boards including a plurality of ventilation slots that are formed in each soffit board (column 1, lines 15-28; column 2, lines 25-38). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punching process of Moran to form the soffit boards taught by Quinnell to provide a rapid and economical method for producing a low cost soffit and fascia system.

With respect to Claim 63, Moran teaches using a generally tubular spool 20 (each of the resilient biasing elements comprises a generally tubular body attached to one of the punches) (see Fig. 1) and driving the punches along a punch stroke (see Fig. 1 and 2) with the spool being retained by the punch as it is attached to the punch (see page 1 of text, right column, lines 23-27).

With respect to Claim 64, the spool 20 (resilient biasing element) is somewhat greater than the length of the punch which projects below the mounting block (a length that is at least coextensive with a length of a corresponding one of the punches) (see page 1 of text, right column, lines 27-33).

With respect to Claim 66, the spool 20 (resilient biasing element) is a tube that receives the punch (see Fig. 1).

With respect to Claims 67 and 68, the spool 20 (resilient biasing element) is natural or synthetic rubber (rubber; polymeric resilient member) (see page 2 of text, left column, lines 26-30).

With respect to Claim 69, with regard to the concept of driving the punches through only a portion of the fiber-cement panel without passing the punches completely through the panel, the examiner stipulates that Kober indirectly teaches this concept as further discussed hereafter. Kober further teaches that the upper platen 9 is provided with trimming blades 25 whose cutting edges are engageable against lead anvil strips 26 inset in the trays 7 to trim the edges all around the fiber plate 3 as the array of holes are punched through the fiber plate 3 (column 3, line 65 - column 4, line 2). As illustrated in the Figures, Kober further teaches that the punch means 8 are slightly shorter, but definitely no longer, in length than the trimming blades 25. If the travel of the trimming blades 25 and the upper platen 9 stops when trimming blades 25 engage against lead anvil strips 26 as taught and the punch means 8 are slightly shorter in length than the trimming blades 25, the punch means 8 in the process of Kober would

obviously only pass through a portion of the fiber plate 3 and would obviously be prevented from passing completely through the fiber plate 3 as claimed.

With respect to Claim 70, Moran teaching passing the punch completely through the sheet material 16 (see Fig. 2), which would necessarily eject any material of the sheet material over the hole, principally because the reference punches the same material using the same steps as claimed.

With respect to Claim 71, Moran teaches placing a sheet material (panel) between one or more punches 10 attached to a retracted support 12 (punch assembly positioned in a retracted position; punch plate; plurality of punches coupled thereto) and a stationary support 15 with holes (support assembly; support plate with a plurality of holes therein corresponding to the arrangement of the punches) (see page 1 of text, left column, lines 1-29 and right column, lines 13-41; Fig. 1). As arranged, the sheet material's first side faces the punch assembly and the second side of the panel faces the support assembly (see Fig. 1). Moran teaches driving the punches along a punch stroke through at least a portion of the sheet material to form a plurality of openings therein (see Fig. 2). Moran teaches rubber spools (resilient biasing elements) attached to the punches (see page 1 of text, right column, lines 23-27). Moran teaches compressing a plurality of rubber spools 20 (resilient biasing elements) as the punches are driven along the punch stroke (see page 1 of text, right column, lines 13-41; Fig. 2).

Moran teaches using a sheet material, but does not expressly teach that the material is a fiber-cement panel.

Kober teaches a method for perforating boards of filamentary material made using asbestos fibers held together by a hydraulic binder such as cement (a fiber-cement panel) (column 1, lines 13-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kober's punching of fiber-cement panels with Moran's invention is for punching sheet material (see Moran, page 1 of text, left column, lines 1-5) and Kober provides a sheet material that is to be punched (see Kober, column 1, lines 13-17).

Moran does not specifically teach that the boards are capable of being used as soffit boards. However, Quinnell teaches a soffit and fascia system comprising cement-based asbestos boards for use as the soffit boards including a plurality of ventilation slots that are formed in each soffit board (column 1, lines 15-28; column 2, lines 25-38). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the punching process of Moran to form the soffit boards taught by Quinnell to provide a rapid and economical method for producing a low cost soffit and fascia system.

With respect to Claim 72, the rubber spool 20 (resilient biasing element) includes an end and at least one lateral peripheral surface (see Fig. 1) and compressing the spool as the punch is driven along the punch stroke allows the lateral peripheral surface to be outwardly laterally displaced when the end is pressed against the first side (see Fig. 2).

With respect to Claim 73, Moran teaches using a generally tubular spool 20 (each of the resilient biasing elements comprises a generally tubular body attached to one of the punches) (see Fig. 1) and driving the punches along a punch stroke (see Fig. 1 and 2) with the spool being retained by the punch as it is attached to the punch (see page 1 of text, right column, lines 23-27).

With respect to Claim 74, Moran teaches that when a number of punches are present, a number of rubber spools are present (a plurality of resilient biasing elements each of which is attached to one of the punches) (see page 2 of text, left column, lines 18-21).

With respect to Claim 75, the spool 20 (resilient biasing element) is somewhat greater than the length of the punch which projects below the mounting block (a length that is at least coextensive with a length of a corresponding one of the punches) (see page 1 of text, right column, lines 27-33).

With respect to Claim 77, the spool 20 (resilient biasing element) is a tube that receives the punch (see Fig. 1).

With respect to Claims 78 and 79, the spool 20 (resilient biasing element) is natural or synthetic rubber (rubber; polymeric resilient member) (see page 2 of text, left column, lines 26-30).

With respect to Claim 80, with regard to the concept of driving the punches through only a portion of the fiber-cement panel without passing the punches completely through the panel, the examiner stipulates that Kober indirectly teaches this concept as further discussed hereafter. Kober further teaches that the upper platen 9 is provided

with trimming blades 25 whose cutting edges are engageable against lead anvil strips 26 inset in the trays 7 to trim the edges all around the fiber plate 3 as the array of holes are punched through the fiber plate 3 (column 3, line 65 - column 4, line 2). As illustrated in the Figures, Kober further teaches that the punch means 8 are slightly shorter, but definitely no longer, in length than the trimming blades 25. If the travel of the trimming blades 25 and the upper platen 9 stops when trimming blades 25 engage against lead anvil strips 26 as taught and the punch means 8 are slightly shorter in length than the trimming blades 25, the punch means 8 in the process of Kober would obviously only pass through a portion of the fiber plate 3 and would obviously be prevented from passing completely through the fiber plate 3 as claimed.

With respect to Claim 81, Moran teaching passing the punch completely through the sheet material 16 (see Fig. 2), which would necessarily eject any material of the sheet material over the hole, principally because the reference punches the same material using the same steps as claimed.

Claims 62, 65, 71, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,962,941 (Kober) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,580,374 (Quinnell) and US 2,225,342 (Hyatt).

With respect to Claims 62 and 71, Kober teaches a method for perforating and trimming boards of filamentary material (a method of fabricating) including providing a fiber plate 3 made using asbestos fibers held together by a hydraulic binder such as cement (a fiber-cement panel); depositing the fiber plate 3 on one of a series of trays 7 linked together into an endless chain passing about terminal rollers; passing each of the

trays 7 into a press 1 (placing the fiber-cement panel between) comprising an upper platen 9 having a plurality of punch means 8 for punching an array of holes in the fiber plate 3 (a punch assembly; the punch assembly having a punch plate and a plurality of punches coupled to the punch plate; the punch assembly positioned in a retracted position; a first side of the panel faces the punch assembly) and a lower platen 5 for supporting the fiber plate 3 during perforating and trimming (a support assembly; a second side of the panel faces the support assembly); and lowering the upper platen 9 such that the punch means 8 punch perforations in the fiber plate and drive plugs out of bores 11 located in the lower platen 5 (the support assembly having a support plate with a plurality of holes; driving the punches at least substantially simultaneously into and through at least a portion of the thickness of the fiber-cement panel to form a plurality of openings in the fiber-cement panel) (column 1, lines 13-17; column 3, lines 12-27; column 4, lines 19-39). As illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, Kober further teaches lowering all of the punch means 8 into fiber plate 3 at substantially the same time (driving the punches comprises penetrating the punches into the fiber-cement panel along the full length of the fiber-cement panel in one stroke of the punches).

Kober does not specifically teach that the boards are capable of being used as soffit boards. However, Quinnell teaches a soffit and fascia system comprising cement-based asbestos boards for use as the soffit boards including a plurality of ventilation slots that are formed in each soffit board (column 1, lines 15-28; column 2, lines 25-38). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made and one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the

punching process of Kober to form the soffit boards taught by Quinnell to provide a rapid and economical method for producing a low cost soffit and fascia system.

Neither Kober nor Quinnell teach using a plurality of resilient biasing elements against the first side of the fiber-cement panel as the punches move along the punch stroke.

Hyatt teaches attaching a punch-stripping device containing resilient means (resilient biasing elements) attached to the punch (see page 1 of text, left column, lines 1-6 and line 55 through right column, line 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hyatt's resilient means in telescoping sleeve members to the punches of Kober in order to remove or strip material from the punching tool (see Hyatt, page 1 of text, left column, lines 1-6). As combined, the resilient biasing elements would necessarily press against the first side of the fiber-cement panel as the punches move along the punch stroke. As may be see in Fig. 1, the biasing element 22 is unconstrained to allow for outward lateral displacement thereof in the upper sleeve 10.

With respect to Claims 65 and 76, Hyatt teaches that the resilient biasing element comprises a spring (see page 1 of text, left column, line 55 through right column, line 13).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 29 August 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As stated at various locations within the Office Action dated 27 February 2006, it is well known to optimize the board thickness (such as on Page 18, first paragraph); punch penetration depths (such as on Page 6, last line through Page 7, line 8); and absolute and relative clearance (such as on Page 12, second full paragraph bridging to following page). Since applicant has not contested this position, it is taken as concession. Therefore, the official notice is now considered admitted prior art.

Applicant argues with respect to the 35 USC 103 rejections. Applicant's arguments appear to be on the grounds that:

1) Quinnell does not teach punching holes in fiber-cement board. Moreover, Quinnell teaches that punching holes in the board is costly. Specifically, plastic ventilator panels are used instead.

2) New Claim 62's and 71's limitation of resilient biasing elements is not taught by Hugo.

The Applicant's arguments are addressed as follows:

1) Kober is the primary reference, which is used to show punching asbestos and its utility. Therefore, Quinnell is not used to show how to punch. Quinnell simply illustrates that a fiber-cement panel is used as a soffit.

1) As Quinnell is not modified to punch the fiber-cement panels, lack of motivation to do so is moot. Instead, Kober is modified to create the board used as a soffit in Quinnell.

2) Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 62 and 71 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Butler whose telephone number is (571) 272-8517. The examiner can normally be reached on Mo.-Th. 7:30 a.m. - 5 p.m. and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PB
Patrick Butler
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 1732

CHRISTINA JOHNSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
11/13/04